

No. ID/RTK/49/83/21684.—Whereas the Governor of Haryana is of the opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the workman Shri Ram Kumar and the management of M/s Ved Lakshmi Flour and General Mills Pvt. Ltd., Bhiwani Road, Rohtak regarding the matter hereinafter appearing;

And whereas the Governor of Haryana considers it desirable to refer the dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (c) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, the Governor of Haryana hereby refers to Labour Court, Rohtak constituted under section 7 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947,—vide Government notification No. 3864-ASO-(E)-Lab/70/13648, dated 8th May, 1970 read with Government notification No. 9641-I-Lab-70/32573, dated 6th November, 1970 the matter specified below being either matter in dispute or matter relevant to or connected with the dispute as between the said management and the workman for adjudication:—

Whether the termination of service of Shri Ram Kumar was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

No. ID/RTK/49-83/21691.—Whereas the Governor of Haryana is of the opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the workman Shri Daya Nand and the management of M/s Ved Lakshmi Flour and General Mills Pvt. Ltd., Bhiwani Road, Rohtak regarding the matter hereinafter appearing;

And whereas the Governor of Haryana considers it desirable to refer the dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (c) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, the Governor of Haryana hereby refers to the Labour Court, Rohtak, constituted under section 7 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947,—vide Government notification No. 3864-ASO (E) Lab/70/13648, dated the 8th May, 1970 read with Government notification No. 9641-I-Lab-70/32573, dated the 6th November, 1970 the matter specified below being either matter in dispute or matter relevant to or connected with the dispute as between the said management and workman for adjudication:—

Whether the termination of service of Shri Daya Nand was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

No. ID/ED/24-83/21768.—Whereas the Governor of Haryana is of the opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the workman Shri Vijay Partap and the management of M/s. Gallent Engineering Enterprises Pvt. Ltd., Plot No. 42, Sector-6, Faridabad regarding the matter hereinafter appearing;

And whereas the Governor of Haryana considers it desirable to refer the dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 the Governor of Haryana hereby refers to the Industrial Tribunal, Haryana, Faridabad constituted under section 7-A of the said Act, the matter specified below being either matter in dispute or matters relevant to or connected with the dispute as between the said management and the workman for adjudication:—

Whether the termination of service of Shri Vijay Partap was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

No. ID/ED/24-83/21775.—Whereas the Governor of Haryana is of the opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the workman Shri Radha Raman and the management of M/s Gallent Engineering Enterprises Pvt. Ltd., Plot No. 42, Sector-6, Faridabad, regarding the matter hereinafter appearing;

And whereas the Governor of Haryana considers it desirable to refer the dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, the Governor of Haryana hereby refers to the Industrial Tribunal, Haryana, Faridabad constituted under section 7-A, of the said Act, the matter specified below, being either matter in dispute or matters relevant to or connected with the dispute as between the said management and the workman for adjudication:—

Whether the termination of service of Shri Radha Raman is justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?